

**APPLICATION FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE**  
**Revised 4/99**

**IMPORTANT:** Please consult the "Instructions for Completing the Project Application" for assistance in completion of this form.

**SUBDIVISION:** City of St. Bernard

**CODE#** 061-69470

**DISTRICT NUMBER:** 2 **COUNTY:** Hamilton **DATE** 09 / 07 / 07

**CONTACT:** Jennifer L. Vatter **PHONE #** ( 513) 721-5500

(THE PROJECT CONTACT PERSON SHOULD BE THE INDIVIDUAL WHO WILL BE AVAILABLE ON A DAY-TO-DAY BASIS DURING THE APPLICATION REVIEW AND SELECTION PROCESS AND WHO CAN BEST ANSWER OR COORDINATE THE RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS)

**FAX** (513) 721-0607 **E-MAIL** jvatter@jmaconsult.com

**PROJECT NAME:** Church Street Improvements

**SUBDIVISION TYPE**

(Check only 1)

- ☐ 1. County  
☒ 2. City  
☐ 3. Township  
☐ 4. Village  
☐ 5. Water/Sanitary District  
(Section 6119 O.R.C.)

**FUNDING TYPE REQUESTED**

(Check All Requested & Enter Amount)

- ☒ 1. Grant \$ 312,500  
☐ 2. Loan \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
☐ 3. Loan Assistance \$ \_\_\_\_\_

**PROJECT TYPE**

(Check Largest Component)

- ☒ 1. Road  
☐ 2. Bridge/Culvert  
☐ 3. Water Supply  
☐ 4. Wastewater  
☐ 5. Solid Waste  
☐ 6. Stormwater

**TOTAL PROJECT COST:** \$ 625,000.00

**FUNDING REQUESTED:** \$ 312,500.00

**DISTRICT RECOMMENDATION**

To be completed by the District Committee ONLY

**GRANT:** \$ 312,500

**SCIP LOAN:** \$ \_\_\_\_\_

**RLP LOAN:** \$ \_\_\_\_\_

**LOAN ASSISTANCE:** \$ \_\_\_\_\_

**RATE:** \_\_\_\_\_ % **TERM:** \_\_\_\_\_ yrs.

**RATE:** \_\_\_\_\_ % **TERM:** \_\_\_\_\_ yrs.

(Check only 1)

- ☒ State Capital Improvement Program  
☐ Local Transportation Improvements Program

☐ Small Government Program

**FOR OPWC USE ONLY**

**PROJECT NUMBER:** C \_\_\_\_\_ / C \_\_\_\_\_

**Local Participation** \_\_\_\_\_ %

**OPWC Participation** \_\_\_\_\_ %

**Project Release Date:** \_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_

**OPWC Approval:** \_\_\_\_\_

**APPROVED FUNDING:** \$ \_\_\_\_\_

**Loan Interest Rate:** \_\_\_\_\_ %

**Loan Term:** \_\_\_\_\_ years

**Maturity Date:** \_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_

**Date Approved:** \_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_

**SCIP Loan** \_\_\_\_\_ **RLP Loan** \_\_\_\_\_

OFFICE OF NEW BURLINGTON  
COUNTY ENGINEER

2007 SEP 21 AM 10:02

		TOTAL DOLLARS	FORCE ACCOUNT DOLLARS
1.1	<b>PROJECT ESTIMATED COSTS:</b> (Round to Nearest Dollar)		
a.)	<b>Basic Engineering Services:</b>	\$ _____	.00
	Preliminary Design	\$ _____	.00
	Final Design	\$ _____	.00
	Bidding	\$ _____	.00
	Construction Phase	\$ _____	.00
	Additional Engineering Services	\$ _____	.00
	*Identify services and costs below.		
b.)	<b>Acquisition Expenses:</b>		
	Land and/or Right-of-Way	\$ _____	.00
c.)	<b>Construction Costs:</b>	\$ 625,000	.00
d.)	<b>Equipment Purchased Directly:</b>	\$ _____	.00
e.)	<b>Permits, Advertising, Legal:</b>	\$ _____	.00
	(Or Interest Costs for Loan Assistance Applications Only)		
f.)	<b>Construction Contingencies:</b>	\$ _____	.00
g.)	<b>TOTAL ESTIMATED COSTS:</b>	\$ 625,000	.00
	*List Additional Engineering Services here:		
	Service:	Cost:	

1.2 **PROJECT FINANCIAL RESOURCES:**  
(Round to Nearest Dollar and Percent)

	DOLLARS	%
a.) Local In-Kind Contributions	\$ <u>          .00</u>	
b.) Local Revenues	\$ <u>312,500 .00</u>	<u>50</u>
c.) Other Public Revenues	\$ <u>          .00</u>	
ODOT	\$ <u>          .00</u>	
Rural Development	\$ <u>          .00</u>	
OEPA	\$ <u>          .00</u>	
OWDA	\$ <u>          .00</u>	
CDBG	\$ <u>          .00</u>	
OTHER <u>                    </u>	\$ <u>          .00</u>	
SUBTOTAL LOCAL RESOURCES:	\$ <u>312,500 .00</u>	<u>50</u>
d.) OPWC Funds		
1. Grant	\$ <u>312,500 .00</u>	<u>50</u>
2. Loan	\$ <u>          .00</u>	
3. Loan Assistance	\$ <u>          .00</u>	
SUBTOTAL OPWC RESOURCES:	\$ <u>312,500 .00</u>	<u>50</u>
TOTAL FINANCIAL RESOURCES:	\$ <u>625,000 .00</u>	<u>100%</u>

1.3 **AVAILABILITY OF LOCAL FUNDS:**

Attach a statement signed by the Chief Financial Officer listed in section 5.2 certifying all local share funds required for the project will be available on or before the earliest date listed in the Project Schedule section.

ODOT PID#                      Sale Date:                       
STATUS: (Check one)  
    Traditional  
    Local Planning Agency (LPA)  
    State Infrastructure Bank

**2.0 PROJECT INFORMATION**

If project is multi-jurisdictional, information must be consolidated in this section.

**2.1 PROJECT NAME: Church Street Improvements**

**2.2 BRIEF PROJECT DESCRIPTION - (Sections A through C):**

**A: SPECIFIC LOCATION:**

The project is located on Church Street from Greenlee Avenue to Rose Hill Lane in the City of St. Bernard. Please see attached project vicinity map.

**PROJECT ZIP CODE: 45217**

**B: PROJECT COMPONENTS:**

- 1.) Full depth pavement removal and replacement
- 2.) Curb removal and replacement
- 3.) Replace/Add new storm catch basins
- 4.) Upgrade existing storm sewer
- 5.) Install new storm sewer system
- 6.) Seeding and Mulching as necessary
- 7.) Install new curb

**C: PHYSICAL DIMENSIONS / CHARACTERISTICS:**

Project Length: 950 LF

Pavement Width: 25 ft.

**D: DESIGN SERVICE CAPACITY:**

Detail current service capacity vs. proposed service level.

Road or Bridge: Current ADT 1,100 Year: 2006 Projected ADT:      Year:

Water/Wastewater: Based on monthly usage of 7,756 gallons per household, attach current rate ordinance. Current Residential Rate: \$         Proposed Rate: \$

Stormwater: Number of households served:     0    

**2.3 USEFUL LIFE / COST ESTIMATE: Project Useful Life: 30 Years.**

Attach Registered Professional Engineer's statement, with original seal and signature confirming the project's useful life indicated above and estimated cost.

### 3.0 REPAIR/REPLACEMENT or NEW/EXPANSION:

TOTAL PORTION OF PROJECT REPAIR/REPLACEMENT	\$ <u>625,000 .00</u>
TOTAL PORTION OF PROJECT NEW/EXPANSION	\$ <u>          .00</u>

### 4.0 PROJECT SCHEDULE: \*

	BEGIN DATE	END DATE
4.1 Engineering/Design:	<u>08 / 01/ 07</u>	<u>06 /01 /08</u>
4.2 Bid Advertisement and Award:	<u>06/ 01/08</u>	<u>07/ 01 /08</u>
4.3 Construction:	<u>07/ 15 /08</u>	<u>12 /30 /09</u>
4.4 Right-of-Way/Land Acquisition:	<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>

\* Failure to meet project schedule may result in termination of agreement for approved projects. Modification of dates must be requested in writing by the CEO of record and approved by the commission once the Project Agreement has been executed. The project schedule should be planned around receiving a Project Agreement on or about July 1st.

### 5.0 APPLICANT INFORMATION:

#### 5.1 CHIEF EXECUTIVE

OFFICER	John Estep
TITLE	Mayor
STREET	110 Washington Avenue
CITY/ZIP	St. Bernard, Ohio 45217
PHONE	513-242-7770
FAX	513-641-1840
E-MAIL	

#### 5.2 CHIEF FINANCIAL

OFFICER	Walter St. Clair
TITLE	Auditor
STREET	110 Washington Avenue
CITY/ZIP	St. Bernard, Ohio 45217
PHONE	513-242-7770
FAX	513-641-1840
E-MAIL	

#### 5.3 PROJECT MANAGER

TITLE	Jennifer L. Vatter
STREET	Project Manager
CITY/ZIP	4357 Harrison Avenue
PHONE	Cincinnati, Ohio 45211
FAX	513-721-5500
E-MAIL	513-721-0607

**Changes in Project Officials must be submitted in writing from the CEO**

## 6.0 ATTACHMENTS/COMPLETENESS REVIEW:

Confirm in the blocks [ ] below that each item listed is attached.

- ☒ [X] A certified copy of the legislation by the governing body of the applicant authorizing a designated official to sign and submit this application and execute contracts. This individual should sign under 7.0, Applicant Certification, below.
- ☒ [X] A certification signed by the applicant's chief financial officer stating all local share funds required for the project will be available on or before the dates listed in the Project Schedule section. If the application involves a request for loan (RLP or SCIP), a certification signed by the CFO which identifies a specific revenue source for repaying the loan also must be attached. Both certifications can be accomplished in the same letter.
- ☐ [ ] A cooperation agreement (if the project involves more than one
- ☒ [X] A registered professional engineer's detailed cost estimate and useful life statement, as required in 164-1-13, 164-1-14, and 164-1-16 of the Ohio Administrative Code. Estimates shall contain an engineer's original seal or stamp and signature, subdivision or district) which identifies the fiscal and administrative responsibilities of each participant.
- ☐ [ ] Projects which include new and expansion components and potentially affect productive farmland should include a statement evaluating the potential impact. If there is a potential impact, the Governor's Executive Order 98-VII and the OPWC Farmland Preservation Review Advisory apply.
- ☐ [ ] Capital Improvements Report: (Required by O.R.C. Chapter 164.06 on standard form)
- ☒ [X] Supporting Documentation: Materials such as additional project description, photographs, economic impact (temporary and/or full time jobs likely to be created as a result of the project), accident reports, impact on school zones, and other information to assist your district committee in ranking your project. Be sure to include supplements which may be required by your *local* District Public Works Integrating Committee.

## 7.0 APPLICANT CERTIFICATION:

The undersigned certifies that: (1) he/she is legally authorized to request and accept financial assistance from the Ohio Public Works Commission; (2) to the best of his/her knowledge and belief, all representations that are part of this application are true and correct; (3) all official documents and commitments of the applicant that are part of this application have been duly authorized by the governing body of the applicant; and, (4) should the requested financial assistance be provided, that in the execution of this project, the applicant will comply with all assurances required by Ohio Law, including those involving Buy Ohio and prevailing wages.

Applicant certifies that physical construction on the project as defined in the application has NOT begun, and will not begin until a Project Agreement on this project has been executed with the Ohio Public Works Commission. Action to the contrary will result in termination of the agreement and withdrawal of Ohio Public Works Commission funding of the project.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Joe Kempe, Service Director  
Certifying Representative

Joe Kempe  
Signature/Date Signed

8-28-07

## Engineer's Estimate

### CHURCH STREET IMPROVEMENTS

#### CITY OF ST. BERNARD

DESCRIPTION	QUANTITY	UNIT	PRICE	COST
Tree Removed/Clearing	1	LS	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 20,000.00
Excavation/Pavement Removed	1900	CY	\$ 22.00	\$ 41,800.00
Driveway Apron (remove & replace)	250	SY	\$ 60.00	\$ 15,000.00
Curb Removed	1900	LF	\$ 5.00	\$ 9,500.00
Catch Basins/Manholes Removed	8	EA	\$ 500.00	\$ 4,000.00
Concrete Walk (remove & replace)	4000	SF	\$ 6.00	\$ 24,000.00
Pipe Removed	200	LF	\$ 10.00	\$ 2,000.00
Excavation, incl. Embankment (undercut)	500	CY	\$ 40.00	\$ 20,000.00
Aggregate Base	850	CY	\$ 50.00	\$ 42,500.00
Asphalt Concrete Base	310	CY	\$ 120.00	\$ 37,200.00
Asphalt Concrete Surface Course	240	CY	\$ 130.00	\$ 31,200.00
4"-8" Conduit	1200	LF	\$ 20.00	\$ 24,000.00
12"-15" Conduit	700	LF	\$ 100.00	\$ 70,000.00
18"-24" Conduit	450	LF	\$ 150.00	\$ 67,500.00
Catch Basin	8	EA	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 24,000.00
Manhole	6	EA	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 18,000.00
Concrete Curb	1900	LF	\$ 13.00	\$ 24,700.00
Maintain Traffic	1	LS	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 15,000.00
Construction Layout Stakes	1	LS	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 20,000.00
Seed & Mulch Restoration	1000	SY	\$ 2.00	\$ 2,000.00
Utility Conflicts (waterline)	1	LS	\$ 30,000.00	\$ 30,000.00
Contingencies	1	LS	\$ 82,600.00	\$ 82,600.00
<b>TOTAL ESTIMATED COST</b>				\$ 625,000.00

*I hereby certify this to be an accurate estimate of the proposed project. The useful life of this project is 30 years.*

**John R. Goedde, P.E.**  
**JMA Consultants, Inc.**

*9-12-07*

**Date**





# City of St. Bernard

Walter T. St. Clair, Auditor


## STATUS OF FUNDS CERTIFICATION

The City of St. Bernard will utilize approximately \$312,500 from its local budget as its participation for the Church Street Improvements Project.



  
Walter St. Clair, Auditor

Date Signed: 9/12/07





# Saint Bernard Hamilton County, Ohio



**RESOLUTION NO. 6, 2007**

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE SERVICE DIRECTOR TO MAKE APPLICATION FOR FISCAL 2008 STATE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FUNDS AND IF FUNDS ARE AWARDED TO EXECUTE GRANT AGREEMENTS ON BEHALF OF THE CITY AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.

WHEREAS, the Council of the City of St. Bernard has determined that it would be in the best interest and to promote the general welfare of the community to apply for 2008 State Capital Improvement Program Funds and if funds are awarded to execute a grant agreement on behalf of the City; now therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ST. BERNARD, STATE OF OHIO:

Section 1. That the City Service Director is hereby authorized to make application(s) for State Capital Improvement Program (SCIP) funds for fiscal year 2008.

Section 2. That if funds are awarded the Service Director is hereby authorized to execute a grant agreement or agreements on behalf of the City.

Section 3. This Ordinance is hereby declared to be an emergency measure necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health and safety. The reason for the emergency is the time frame for the application to be submitted. Therefore, this Ordinance shall take effect immediately by and upon its passage, and the approval of two-thirds of the members of said Council. However, this Ordinance shall take effect on the earliest date provided by law if approved by no more than the majority of the members of Council and in that event the emergency provisions herein are set at naught.

Passed this 6<sup>th</sup> day of Sept., 2007.

C. Curtis Wadd  
President of Council

ATTEST:

M. Sue Kathman  
Clerk of Council

Approved this 6<sup>th</sup> day of Sept., 2007.

John Estep  
Mayor

I, M. SUE KATHMAN, CLERK OF COUNCIL, CITY OF ST. BERNARD, STATE OF OHIO, DO HEREBY testify that the publication of Resolution No. 6, 2007, was made by posting true copies of the same in the most public places designated by Council: St. Bernard Square Bus Stop; Vine Street and Washington Avenue; Bertus Street Park; Greenlee Avenue and Jefferson Avenue; Sullivan Avenue and Delmar Avenue; each for a period of fifteen (15) days or more commencing Sept. 6<sup>th</sup>, 2007.

ATTEST: M. Sue Kathman DATE 9.6.07  
Clerk of Council

Approved as to form Edward J. Sauer Date 9.6.07  
Director of Law

## ADDITIONAL SUPPORT INFORMATION

For Program Year 2008 (July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2009), jurisdictions shall provide the following support information to help determine which projects will be funded. Information on this form must be accurate, and where called for, based on sound engineering principles. Documentation to substantiate the individual items, as noted, is required. The applicant should also use the rating system and its' addendum as a guide. The examples listed in this addendum are not a complete list, but only a small sampling of situations that may be relevant to a given project.

**IF YOU ARE APPLYING FOR A GRANT, WILL YOU BE WILLING TO ACCEPT A LOAN IF ASKED BY THE DISTRICT?   X   YES        NO (ANSWER REQUIRED)**

Note: Answering "Yes" will not increase your score and answering "NO" will not decrease your score.

**1) What is the physical condition of the existing infrastructure that is to be replaced or repaired?**

Give a statement of the nature of the deficient conditions of the present facility exclusive of capacity, serviceability, health and/or safety issues. If known, give the approximate age of the infrastructure to be replaced, repaired, or expanded. Use documentation (if possible) to support your statement. Documentation may include (but is not limited to): ODOT BR86 reports, pavement management condition reports, televised underground system reports, age inventory reports, maintenance records, etc., and will only be considered if included in the original application. Examples of deficiencies include: structural condition; substandard design elements such as widths, grades, curves, sight distances, drainage structures, etc.

**The existing facility is exhibiting severe distress and has an extremely rough driving surface. It has reached the end of its useful life. There are numerous potholes, and the base has failed. The existing curb on these streets is severely crumbling in some areas and either buried or non-existent in other areas. The roadway must be reconstructed. The street will need to be lowered in order to gain sufficient curb reveal to convey surface runoff. This will result in numerous utility conflicts.**

**2) How important is the project to the safety of the Public and the citizens of the District and/or service area?**

Give a statement of the projects effect on the safety of the service area. The design of the project is intended to reduce existing accident rate, promote safer conditions, and reduce the danger of risk, liability or injury. (Typical examples may include the effects of the completed project on accident rates, emergency response time, fire protection, and highway capacity.) Please be specific and provide documentation if necessary to substantiate the data. The applicant must demonstrate the type of problems that exist, the frequency and severity of the problems and the method of correction.

**The roadway is approximately 25 feet wide (FC to FC), and there is parking on both sides of the street (leaving 8 ft. for vehicular traffic). This makes travel for residents and emergency vehicles unsafe between Greenlee and the cemetery where additional width for parking is available. Therefore, the road will be widened to 28 ft. BC to BC making travel safer between Greenlee and the cemetery. The drainage system is insufficient and will be upgraded with new storm sewer and new and additional catch basins.**

**3) How important is the project to the health of the Public and the citizens of the District and/or service area?**

Give a statement of the projects effect on the health of the service area. The design of the project will improve the overall condition of the facility so as to reduce or eliminate potential for disease, or correct concerns regarding the environmental health of the area. (Typical examples may include the effects of the completed project by improving or adding storm drainage or sanitary facilities, etc.). Please be specific and provide documentation if necessary to substantiate the data. The applicant must demonstrate the type of problems that exist, the frequency and severity of the problems and the method of correction.

N/A

**4) Does the project help meet the infrastructure repair and replacement needs of the applying jurisdiction?**

The jurisdiction must submit a listing in priority order of the projects for which it is applying. Points will be awarded on the basis of most to least importance.

Priority 1 Rose Hill Lane and Rose Hill Avenue Improvements

Priority 2 Church Street Improvements

Priority 3 \_\_\_\_\_

Priority 4 \_\_\_\_\_

Priority 5 \_\_\_\_\_

**5) To what extent will the user fee funded agency be participating in the funding of the project?**

(example: rates for water or sewer, frontage assessments, etc.).

No participation – Zero (0)%

**6) Economic Growth – How will the completed project enhance economic growth**

Give a statement of the projects effect on the economic growth of the service area (be specific).

N/A

**7) Matching Funds - LOCAL**

The information regarding local matching funds is to be filed by the applicant in Section 1.2 (b) of the Ohio Public Works Association's "Application For Financial Assistance" form.

**8) Matching Funds - OTHER**

The information regarding local matching funds is to be filed by the applicant in Section 1.2 (c) of the Ohio Public Works Association's "Application For Financial Assistance" form. If MRF funds are being used for matching funds, the MRF application must have been filed by August 31st of this year for this

project with the Hamilton County Engineer's Office. List below all "other" funding the source(s).  
Local funding is utilized for matching funds for this project.

- 9) Will the project alleviate serious traffic problems or hazards or respond to the future level of service needs of the district?

Describe how the proposed project will alleviate serious traffic problems or hazards (be specific).

For roadway betterment projects, provide the existing and proposed Level of Service (LOS) of the facility using the methodology outlined within AASHTO'S "Geometric Design of Highways and Streets" and the 1985 Highway Capacity Manual.

Existing LOS \_\_\_\_\_ Proposed LOS \_\_\_\_\_

If the proposed design year LOS is not "C" or better, explain why LOS "C" cannot be achieved.

- 10) If SCIP/LTIP funds were granted, when would the construction contract be awarded?

If SCIP/LTIP funds are awarded, how soon after receiving the Project Agreement from OPWC (tentatively set for July 1 of the year following the deadline for applications) would the project be under contract? The Support Staff will review status reports of previous projects to help judge the accuracy of a jurisdiction's anticipated project schedule.

Number of months 2

- a.) Are preliminary plans or engineering completed? Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_ N/A \_\_\_\_\_
- b.) Are detailed construction plans completed? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No X N/A \_\_\_\_\_
- c.) Are all utility coordination's completed? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No X N/A \_\_\_\_\_
- d.) Are all right-of-way and easements acquired (if applicable)?  
Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ N/A X

If no, how many parcels needed for project? \_\_\_\_\_ Of these, how many are: Takes \_\_\_\_\_

Temporary \_\_\_\_\_

Permanent \_\_\_\_\_

For any parcels not yet acquired, explain the status of the ROW acquisition process for this project.

e.) Give an estimate of time needed to complete any item above not yet completed. 8 Months.

**11) Does the infrastructure have regional impact?**

Give a brief statement concerning the regional significance of the infrastructure to be replaced, repaired, or expanded.

---

**12) What is the overall economic health of the jurisdiction?**

The District 2 Integrating Committee predetermines the jurisdiction's economic health. The economic health of a jurisdiction may periodically be adjusted when census and other budgetary data are updated.

**13) Has any formal action by a federal, state, or local government agency resulted in a partial or complete ban of the usage or expansion of the usage for the involved infrastructure?**

Describe what formal action has been taken which resulted in a ban of the use of or expansion of use for the involved infrastructure? Typical examples include weight limits, truck restrictions, and moratoriums or limitations on issuance of building permits, etc. The ban must have been caused by a structural or operational problem to be considered valid. Submission of a copy of the approved legislation would be helpful.

---

---

Will the ban be removed after the project is completed? Yes        No        N/A X

**14) What is the total number of existing daily users that will benefit as a result of the proposed project?**

For roads and bridges, multiply current Average Daily Traffic (ADT) by 1.20. For inclusion of public transit, submit documentation substantiating the count. Where the facility currently has any restrictions or is partially closed, use documented traffic counts prior to the restriction. For storm sewers, sanitary sewers, water lines, and other related facilities, multiply the number of households in the service area by 4. User information must be documented and certified by a professional engineer or the jurisdictions' C.E.O.

Traffic: ADT 1,100 X 1.20 = 1,320 Users

Water/Sewer: Homes        X 4.00 =        Users

**15) Has the jurisdiction enacted the optional \$5 license plate fee, an infrastructure levy, a user fee, or dedicated tax for the pertinent infrastructure?**

The applying jurisdiction shall list what type of fees, levies or taxes they have dedicated toward the type of infrastructure being applied for. (Check all that apply)

Optional \$5.00 License Tax yes

Infrastructure Levy        Specify type       

Facility Users Fee        Specify type       

Dedicated Tax        Specify type       

Other Fee, Levy or Tax        Specify type

**SCIP/LTIP PROGRAM  
ROUND 22 - PROGRAM YEAR 2008  
PROJECT SELECTION CRITERIA  
JULY 1, 2008 TO JUNE 30, 2009**

NAME OF APPLICANT: City of St. Bernard

NAME OF PROJECT: Church Street Improvements

RATING TEAM: 5

**General Statement for Rating Criteria**

Points awarded for all items will be based on engineering experience, field verification, application information and other information supplied by the applying agency, which is deemed to be relevant by the Support Staff. The examples listed in this addendum are not a complete list, but only a small sampling of situations that may be relevant to a given project.

**CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE RATING**

What is the physical condition of the existing infrastructure that is to be replaced or repaired?

25 - Failed

23 - Critical

20 - Very Poor

☒ 17 - Poor

15 - Moderately Poor

10 - Moderately Fair

5 - Fair Condition

0 - Good or Better

Appeal Score

\_\_\_\_\_

**Criterion 1 - Condition**

Condition of the particular infrastructure to be repaired, reconstructed or replaced shall be a measure of the degree of reduction in condition from its original state. Historic pavement management data based on ASTM D6433-99 rating system may be submitted as documentation. Capacity, serviceability, safety and health shall not be considered in this criterion. Any documentation the Applicant wishes to be considered must be included in the application package.

**Definitions:**

**Failed Condition** - requires complete reconstruction where no part of the existing facility is salvageable. (E.g. Roads: complete reconstruction of roadway, curbs and base; Bridges: complete removal and replacement of bridge; Underground: removal and replacement of an underground drainage or water system.

**Critical Condition** - requires partial reconstruction to maintain integrity. (E.g. Roads: reconstruction of roadway/curbs can be saved; Bridges: removal and replacement of bridge with abutment modification; Underground: removal and replacement of part of an underground drainage or water system.

**Very Poor Condition** - requires extensive rehabilitation to maintain integrity. (E.g. Roads: extensive full depth, partial depth and curb repair of a roadway with a structural overlay; Bridges: superstructure replacement; Underground: repair of joints and/or replacement of pipe sections.

**Poor Condition** - requires standard rehabilitation to maintain integrity. (E.g. Roads: moderate full depth, partial depth and curb repair to a roadway with no structural overlay needed or structural overlay with minor repairs to a roadway needed; Bridges: extensive patching of substructure and replacement of deck; Underground: insituform or other in ground repairs.

**Moderately Poor Condition** - requires minor rehabilitation to maintain integrity. (E.g. Roads: minor full depth, partial depth or curb repairs to a roadway with either a thin overlay or no overlay needed; Bridges: major structural patching and/or major deck repair.

**Moderately Fair Condition** - requires extensive maintenance to maintain integrity. (E.g. Roads: thin or no overlay with extensive crack sealing, minor partial depth and/or slurry or rejuvenation; Bridges: minor structural patching, deck repair, erosion control.)

**Fair Condition** - requires routine maintenance to maintain integrity. (E.g. Roads: slurry seal, rejuvenation or routine crack sealing to the roadway; Bridges: minor structural patching.)

**Good or Better Condition** - little to no maintenance required to maintain integrity.

**Note:** If the infrastructure is in "good" or better condition, it will **NOT** be considered for SCIP/LTIP funding unless it is an expansion project that will improve serviceability.

2) How important is the project to the safety of the Public and the citizens of the District and/or service area?

- 25 - Highly significant importance
- 20 - Considerably significant importance
- 15 - Moderate importance
- 10 - Minimal importance
- 5 - Poorly documented importance
- 0 - No measurable impact

Appeal Score

\_\_\_\_\_

**Criterion 2 – Safety**

The applying agency shall include in its application the type frequency, and severity of the safety problem deficiency that currently exists and how the intended project would improve the situation. For example, have there been vehicular accidents attributable to the problems cited? Have they involved injuries or fatalities? In the case of water systems, are existing hydrants non-functional? In the case of water lines, is the present capacity inadequate to provide volumes or pressure for adequate fire protection? In all cases, specific documentation is required. Mentioned problems, which are poorly documented, shall generally will not receive more than 5 points.

Note: Each project is looked at on an individual basis to determine if any aspects of this category apply. Examples given above are NOT intended to be exclusive.

3) How important is the project to the health of the Public and the citizens of the District and/or service area?

- 25 - Highly significant importance
- 20 - Considerably significant importance
- 15 - Moderate importance
- 10 - Minimal importance
- 5 - Poorly documented importance
- 0 - No measurable impact

Appeal Score

\_\_\_\_\_

**Criterion 3 – Health**

The applying agency shall include in its application the type, frequency, and severity of the health problem that would be eliminated or reduced by the intended project. For example, can the problem be eliminated only by the project, or would routine maintenance be satisfactory? If basement flooding has occurred, was it storm water or sanitary flow? What complaints if any are recorded? In the case of underground improvements, how will they improve health if they are storm sewers? How would improved sanitary sewers improve health or reduce health risk? In all cases, quantified documentation is required. Mentioned problems, which are poorly documented, shall generally will not receive more than 5 points.

Note: Each project is looked at on an individual basis to determine if any aspects of this category apply. Examples given above are NOT intended to be exclusive.

4) Does the project help meet the infrastructure repair and replacement needs of the applying agency?

Note: Applying agency's priority listing (part of the Additional Support Information) must be filed with application(s).

- 25 - First priority project
- 20 - Second priority project
- 15 - Third priority project
- 10 - Fourth priority project
- 5 - Fifth priority project or lower

Appeal Score

\_\_\_\_\_

**Criterion 4 – Jurisdiction's Priority Listing**

The applying agency must submit a listing in priority order of the projects for which it is applying. Points will be awarded on the basis of most to least importance. The form is included in the Additional Support Information.



5) To what extent will a user fee funded agency be participating in the funding of the project?

10 – Less than 10%

9 – 10% to 19.99%

8 – 20% to 29.99%

7 – 30% to 39.99%

6 – 40% to 49.99%

5 – 50% to 59.99%

4 – 60% to 69.99%

3 – 70% to 79.99%

2 – 80% to 89.99%

1 – 90% to 95%

0 – Above 95%

Appeal Score

\_\_\_\_\_

**Criterion 5 – User Fee-funded Agency Participation**

To what extent will a user fee funded agency be participating in the funding of the project? (Example: rates for water or sewer, frontage assessments, etc.). The applying agency must submit documentation.

6) Economic Growth – How the completed project will enhance economic growth (See definitions).

10 – The project will directly secure new employment

Appeal Score

5 – The project will permit more development

0 – The project will not impact development

\_\_\_\_\_

**Criterion 6 – Economic Growth**

Will the completed project enhance economic growth and/or development in the service area?

**Definitions:**

**Secure new employment:** The project as designed will secure development/employers, which will immediately add new permanent employees to the jurisdiction. The applying agency must submit details.

**Permit more development:** The project as designed will permit additional business development/employment. The applying agency must supply details.

**The project will not impact development:** The project will have no impact on business development.

**Note:** Each project is looked at on an individual basis to determine if any aspects of this category apply.

7) Matching Funds - LOCAL

10 – This project is a loan or credit enhancement

10 – 50% or higher

8 – 40% to 49.99%

6 – 30% to 39.99%

4 – 20% to 29.99%

2 – 10% to 19.99%

0 – Less than 10%

List total percentage of "Local" funds 50 %

**Criterion 7 – Matching Funds – Local**

The percentage of matching funds which come directly from the budget of the applying agency. Ten points shall be awarded if a loan request is at least 50% of the total project cost. (If the applying agency is not a user fee funded agency, any funds to be provided by a user fee generating agency will be considered "Matching Funds – Other").

8)

**Matching Funds – OTHER**

List total percentage of “Other” funds 0 %

- 10 – 50% or higher
- 8 – 40% to 49.99%
- 6 – 30% to 39.99%
- 4 – 20% to 29.99%
- 2 – 10% to 19.99%
- 1 – 1% to 9.99%
- 0 – Less than 1%

List below each funding source and percentage

_____	_____ %
_____	_____ %
_____	_____ %
_____	_____ %
_____	_____ %

**Criterion 8 – Matching Funds - Other**

The percentage of matching funds that come from funding sources other than those mentioned in Criterion 7. A letter from the outside funding agency stating their financial participation in the project and the amount of funding is required to receive points. For MRF, a copy of the current application form filed with the Hamilton County Engineer’s Office meets the requirement.

9)

Will the project alleviate serious capacity problems or hazards or respond to the future level of service needs of the district?

- 10 - Project design is for future demand.
- 8 - Project design is for partial future demand.
- 6 - Project design is for current demand.
- 4 - Project design is for minimal increase in capacity.
- 2 - Project design is for no increase in capacity.

**Appeal Score**

\_\_\_\_\_

**Criterion 9 – Alleviate Capacity Problems**

The applying agency shall provide a narrative, along with pertinent support documentation, which describe the existing deficiencies and showing how congestion will be reduced or eliminated and how service will be improved to meet the needs of any expected growth or development. A formal capacity analysis accompanying the application would be beneficial. Projected traffic or demand should be calculated as follows:

**Formula:**

Existing users x design year factor = projected users

Design Year	Design year factor		
	Urban	Suburban	Rural
20	1.40	1.70	1.60
10	1.20	1.35	1.30

**Definitions:**

**Future demand** – Project will eliminate existing congestion or deficiencies and will provide sufficient capacity or service for twenty-year projected demand or fully developed area conditions. Justification must be supplied if the area is already largely developed or undevelopable and thus the projection factors used deviate from the above table.

**Partial future demand** – Project will eliminate existing congestion or deficiencies and will provide sufficient capacity or service for ten-year projected demand or partially developed area conditions. Justification must be supplied if the area is already largely developed or undevelopable and thus the projection factors used deviate from the above table.

**Current demand** – Project will eliminate existing congestion or deficiencies and will provide sufficient capacity or service only for existing demand and conditions.

**Minimal increase** – Project will reduce but not eliminate existing congestion or deficiencies and will provide a minimal but less than sufficient increase in existing capacity or service for existing demand and conditions.

**No increase** – Project will have no effect on existing congestion or deficiencies and provide no increase in capacity or service for existing demand and conditions.

10) Readiness to Proceed - If SCIP/LTIP funds are granted, when would the construction contract be awarded?

- 5 - Will be under contract by December 31, 2008 and no delinquent projects in Rounds 19 & 20  
3 - Will be under contract by March 31, 2009 and/or one delinquent project in Rounds 19 & 20  
0 - Will not be under contract by March 31, 2009 and/or more than one delinquent project in Rounds 19 & 20

**Criterion 10 – Readiness to Proceed**

The Support Staff will assign points based on engineering experience and status of design plans. A project is considered delinquent when it has not received a notice to proceed within the time stated on the original application and no time extension has been granted by the OPWC. An applying agency receiving approval for a project and subsequently canceling the same after the bid date on the application will receive zero (0) points under this round and the following round.

11) Does the infrastructure have regional impact? Consider origination and destination of traffic, functional classifications, size of service area, and number of jurisdictions served, etc.

10 – Major Impact

8 – Significant Impact

6 – Moderate Impact

4 – Minor Impact

2 – Minimal or No Impact

Appeal Score

\_\_\_\_\_

**Criterion 11 - Regional Impact**

The regional significance of the infrastructure that is being repaired or replaced.

**Definitions:**

**Major Impact** – Roads: Major Arterial: A direct connector to an Interstate Highway; Arterials are intended to provide a greater degree of mobility rather than land access. Arterials generally convey large traffic volumes for distances greater than one mile. A major arterial is a highway that is of regional importance and is intended to serve beyond the county. It may connect urban centers with one another and/or with outlying communities and employment or shopping centers. A major arterial is intended primarily to serve through traffic.

**Significant Impact** – Roads: Minor Arterial: A roadway, also serving through traffic, that is similar in function to a major arterial, but operates with lower traffic volumes, serves trips of shorter distances (but still greater than one mile), and may provide a higher degree of property access than do major arterials.

**Moderate Impact** – Roads: Major Collector: A roadway that provides for traffic movement between local roads/streets and arterials or community-wide activity centers and carries moderate traffic volumes over moderate distances (generally less than one mile). Major collectors may also provide direct access to abutting properties, such as regional shopping centers, large industrial parks, major subdivisions and community-wide recreational facilities, but typically not individual residences. Most major collectors are also county roads and are therefore through streets.

**Minor Impact** – Roads: Minor Collector: A roadway similar in functions to a major collector but which carries lower traffic volumes over shorter distances and has a higher degree of property access. Minor collectors may serve as main circulation streets within large, residential neighborhoods. Most minor collectors are also township roads and streets and may, or may not, be through streets.

**Minimal or No Impact** - Roads: Local: A roadway that is primarily intended to provide access to abutting properties. It tends to accommodate lower traffic volumes, serves short trips (generally within neighborhoods), and provides connections preferably only to collector streets rather than arterials.

12) What is the overall economic health of the jurisdiction?

10 Points

8 Points

6 Points

4 Points

2 Points

**Criterion 12 – Economic Health**

The District 2 Integrating Committee predetermines the applying agency's economic health. The economic health of a jurisdiction may periodically be adjusted when census and other budgetary data are updated.

13) Has any formal action by a federal, state, or local government agency resulted in a partial or complete ban of the usage or expansion of the usage for the involved infrastructure?

10 - Complete ban, facility closed

Appeal Score

8 – 80% reduction in legal load or 4-wheeled vehicles only

7 – Moratorium on future development, *not* functioning for current demand

6 – 60% reduction in legal load

5 - Moratorium on future development, functioning for current demand

4 – 40% reduction in legal load

2 – 20% reduction in legal load

0 – Less than 20% reduction in legal load

**Criterion 13 - Ban**

The applying agency shall provide documentation to show that a facility ban or moratorium has been formally placed. The ban or moratorium must have been caused by a structural or operational problem. Points will only be awarded if the end result of the project will cause the ban to be lifted.

14) What is the total number of existing daily users that will benefit as a result of the proposed project?

10 - ~~16,000~~ 30,000 or more

Appeal Score

8 - ~~12,000~~ 21,000 to 29,999 ~~15,999~~

6 - ~~8,000~~ 12,000 to 20,999 ~~11,999~~

4 - ~~4,000~~ 3,000 to 11,999 ~~7,999~~

2 - ~~3,999~~ 2,999 and under

**Criterion 14 - Users**

The applying agency shall provide documentation. A registered professional engineer or the applying agency's C.E.O must certify the appropriate documentation. Documentation may include current traffic counts, households served, when converted to a measurement of persons. Public transit users are permitted to be counted for the roads and bridges, but only when certifiable ridership figures are provided.

5) Has the applying agency enacted the optional \$5 license plate fee, an infrastructure levy, a user fee, or dedicated tax for the pertinent infrastructure? *(Provide documentation of which fees have been enacted.)*

5 - Two or more of the above

Appeal Score

3 - One of the above

0 - None of the above

**Criterion 15 – Fees, Levies, Etc.**


The applying agency shall document (in the "Additional Support Information" form) which type of fees, levies or taxes they have dedicated toward the type of infrastructure being applied for.



Church Street



Church Street




Churan Street



Churan Street





City of St. Bernard - Union St.